



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/637,184	08/08/2003	Daryl Carvis Cromer	RPS920020126US1	3939
53493	7590	05/28/2008		
LENOVO (US) IP Law 1009 Think Place Building One, 4th Floor 4B6 Morrisville, NC 27560			EXAMINER DEBNATH, SUMAN	
			ART UNIT 2135	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 05/28/2008	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/637,184	Applicant(s) CROMER ET AL.	
	Examiner SUMAN DEBNATH	Art Unit 2135	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 January 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-35 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-35 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-35 are pending in this application.
2. Claims 1, 5, 8, 17, 25 and 29 are presently amended.
3. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office Action.

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

4. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 25 January 2008 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. Claims 1-4, 13-16 and 25-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Watts (Patent No.: US 6,327,623 B2) in view of Guzman et al. (Patent No.: US 7,058,847 B1), hereinafter "Guzman".
6. As to claim 1, Watts a program product comprising: a computer useable medium having computer readable program code stored therein, the computer readable program code in said program product being effective when executing to: accept personality selection input provided by a user to the computer (column 9, lines 30-35) which has a storage device adapted to store various

data files (column 16, lines 37-50) and to assume a selected personality in the computer based on the provided input (column 9, lines 30-35 and lines 54-65, which describes user explicitly selects an environment (i.e. office) which would indicate environment as claimed by the applicant “assume a selected personality selection input in the computer based on provided input.” In this case, Furthermore, Applicant should note that assuming a selected personality (i.e. location) either automatically without user’s confirmation/authorization or by having an user verifying/confirming prior to making the changes to the computer is just a matter of design choice and any one with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made would understand and would implement as would required by a system depending upon how much flexibility required by user); files to be stored in the storage device according to the selected personality (“.....set at the directory holding the files located on the selected workspace”, e.g., see column 16, lines 37-50);

Watts doesn’t explicitly disclose tag files to be stored in the storage device according to the selected personality and implement a filter which (a) passes files tagged according to the selected personality to an application executing within the computer and removes the tags applied by the code which is effective to tag files and which (b) blocks files not tagged according to the selected personality from being passed to the application executing within the computer.

However, Guzman discloses tag files to be stored in the storage device according to the selected personality (column 11, lines 60-67 - column 12, lines 1-10) and implement a filter which (a) passes files tagged according to the selected personality and removes the tags applied by the code which is effective to tag files (column 13, lines 5-15) and which (b) blocks files not tagged according to the selected personality from being passed to the application executing within the computer (column 11, lines 60-67 to column 12, lines 1-10).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the teaching of Watts by tagging files to be stored and by implementing a filter to remove the tag and to block files not tagged as taught by Guzman in order to access a file system related to a specific workspace in a secure manner.

7. As to claims 13 and 25, these are rejected using the same rationale as for the rejection of claim 1.

8. As to claims 2, 14 and 26, Watts discloses wherein accepting personality selection input is independent of user login identity information (column 8, lines 45-65, column 10, lines 40-65 and column 16, lines 35-50, Watts teaches of accepting personality selection input that is independent of user login identity information by having a viewable workspace when detects changes).

9. As to claims 3,15 and 27, Watts discloses wherein accepting personality selection input accepts the input as a function of user login identity information (column 9, lines 30-55).

10. As to claims 4, 16 and 28, Watts doesn't explicitly disclose wherein tagging files appends characters to the data file name. However, Guzman discloses wherein tagging files appends characters to the data file name (column 11, lines 60-67 - column 12, lines 1-10).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the teaching of Watts by including tagging files appends characters to

the data file name as taught by Guzman in order to access a file system related to a specific workspace in a secure manner.

11. Claims 5-12, 17-24 and 29-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Watts in view of Guzman and further in view of Kataoka et al. (Patent Number: 5,857,021), hereinafter "Kataoka".

12. As to claim 5, Watts discloses a program product comprising: a computer useable medium having computer readable program code stored therein, the computer readable program code in said program product being effective (abstract) when executing to: accept and authenticate input provided by a user selected from a plurality of personality selection inputs to a computer (column 9, lines 30-35) which has a storage device adapted to store various data files (column 16, lines 37-50) and assume a selected personality in the computer based on the provided input (column 9, lines 30-35 and lines 54-65, which describes user explicitly selects an environment (i.e. office) which would indicate environment as claimed by the applicant "assume a selected personality selection input in the computer based on provided input." In this case, Watts teaches that user made the selection and that selection was not made based on any response to a prompt provided in response to determining that a location of the computer has changed. Furthermore, Applicant should note that assuming a selected personality (i.e. location) either automatically without user's confirmation/authorization or by having an user verifying/confirming prior to making the changes to the computer is just a matter of design choice and any one with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made would understand and would implement as would required by a system depending upon how much flexibility

required by user); files to be stored in the storage device according to the selected personality wherein the contents of the files are stored on the storage device (“.....set at the directory holding the files located on the selected workspace”, e.g., see column 16, lines 37-50); wherein, when at least one application other than an operating system is executed in the computer, a change in the selected personality based on newly provided input does not require termination of the at least one application (column 9, lines 30-35 and lines 54-65, column 10, lines 40-60).

Watts doesn't explicitly disclose tag files to be stored in an encrypted format and implement a filter which (a) passes files tagged according to the selected personality to an application executing within the computer and removes the tags applied by the code which is effective to tag files and decrypts the contents of tagged files which have been stored in an encrypted format on the storage device and which (b) blocks files not tagged according to the selected personality from being passed to the application executing within the computer.

However, Guzman discloses tag files to be stored in the storage device according to the selected personality (column 11, lines 60-67 to column 12, lines 1-10) and implement a filter which (a) passes files tagged from being passed to the application executing within the computer and removes the tags applied by the code which is effective to tag files (“...restoration engine 404 remove character fields and renames the restoration file ..” - e.g., column 13, lines 5-15) and which (b) blocks files not tagged according to the selected personality from being passed to the application executing within the computer (column 11, lines 60-67 - column 12, lines 1-10, Guzman teaching this concept by appending a filename designation with an associated unique identifier and as described by Guzman this identifier can be used in the computer system for later use for restoration processing which would let the user access the appropriate file (i.e. files with associated unique identifier).

Applicant should note that if the files can be viewed remotely according to the network element with which file data is associated then this implementation can be done only within a computer).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the teaching of Watts by tagging files to be stored and by implementing a filter to remove the tag and to block files not tagged as taught by Guzman in order to access a file system related to a specific workspace in a secure manner.

Neither Watts nor Guzman explicitly disclose storing file in an encrypted format and decrypting file that have been stored in an encrypted format on the storage device. However, Kataoka discloses storing file in an encrypted format (abstract, FIG. 6) and decrypting file that have been stored in an encrypted format on the storage device (abstract, FIG. 7).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention was made to modify the teaching of Watts and Guzman by storing file in an encrypted format and decrypting file that have been stored in an encrypted format on the storage device as taught by Kataoka in order to provide “a reliable security systems to protect information in storage media from unauthorized access” (Kataoka).

13. As to claims 17 and 29, these are rejected using the same rationale as for the rejection of claim 5.

14. As to claims 6, 18 and 30, Watts discloses selected personality (column 10, lines 30-60). Watts doesn't explicitly disclose implementing the filter further passes files tagged as universal irrespective of the selected personality and thereby overrides the filter action (b) which otherwise blocks files not

tagged according to the selected Personality. However, Guzman discloses implementing the filter further passes files tagged as universal irrespective of the selected personality and thereby overrides the filter action (“...restoration engine 404 remove character fields and renames the restoration file” - e.g., column 13, lines 5-15) (b) which otherwise blocks files not tagged according to a selected personality (column 11, lines 60-67 - column 12, lines 1-10, Guzman teaching of blocking file not tagged by associating a specific unique identifier with the file name).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the teaching of Watts by implementing the filter which further passes files tagged as universal irrespective of the selected personality and thereby overrides the filter action (b) which otherwise blocks files not tagged according to the selected personality as taught by Guzman in order to access a file system related to a specific workspace in a secure manner.

15. As to claims 7, 19 and 31, these are rejected using the same rationale as for the rejection of claim 6.

16. As to claims 8, 20 and 32, Watts discloses wherein a call to selected authentications, of the input provided by a user selected from a plurality of personality selection inputs, performed by accepting and authenticates (column 9, lines 35-65 and column 10, lines 30-55). Watts doesn't explicitly disclose call to a cryptographic processor that the encryption performed by the code that implements the filter, and the decryption performed the code that implements the filter. However, Guzman discloses implementing a filter (column 11, lines 60-67 to column 12, lines 1-10 and column 13, lines 5-15).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the teaching of Watts by implementing a filter as taught by Guzman in order to access a file system related to a specific workspace in a secure manner.

Neither Watts nor Guzman explicitly disclose calling a cryptographic processor, which determines the encryption and decryption performed. However, Kataoka discloses calling a cryptographic processor, which determines the encryption and decryption performed (abstract, FIG. 6 and FIG. 7).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention was made to modify the teaching of Watts and Guzman by storing file in an encrypted format and decrypting file that have been stored in an encrypted format on the storage device as taught by Kataoka in order to provide “a reliable security systems to protect information in storage media from unauthorized access” (Kataoka).

17. As to claims 9, 21 and 33, neither Watts nor Guzman discloses wherein the cryptographic processor called is a trusted platform module. However, Kataoka discloses wherein the cryptographic processor called is a trusted platform module (FIG. 6 and FIG. 7, Kataoka discloses trusted platform module by validating identification before encrypting or decrypting any data).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention was made to modify the teaching of Watts and Guzman by including wherein the cryptographic processor called is a trusted platform module as taught by Kataoka in order to provide “a reliable security systems to protect information in storage media from unauthorized access” (Kataoka).

18. As to claim 10, 22 and 34, Watts discloses wherein accepting personality selection input is independent of user login identity information (column 8, lines 45-65, column 10, lines 40-65 and column 16, lines 35-50, Watts teaches of accepting personality selection input that is independent of user login identity information by having a viewable workspace when detects changes).

19. As to claim 11, 23 and 35, Watts discloses wherein accepting personality selection input accepts the input as a function of user login identity information (column 10-65, "...if the user accepts the changes, the configuration is changed..").

20. As to claim 12 and 24, Watts doesn't explicitly disclose wherein tagging files that appends characters to the data file name. However, Guzman discloses wherein tagging files that appends characters to the data file name (column 11, lines 60-67 - column 12, lines 1-10).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the teaching of Watts by including wherein tagging files that appends characters to the data file name as taught by Guzman in order to access a file system related to a specific workspace in a secure manner.

21. Examiner's note: Examiner has cited particular columns and line numbers in the references as applied to the claims above for the convenience of the applicant. Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings in the art and are applied to the specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures may be applied as well. It is respectfully requested from the applicant, in preparing the responses, to fully consider the references in entirety as potentially

teaching all or part of the claimed invention as well as the context of the passage as taught by the prior art or disclosed by the examiner.

Response to Arguments

22. Applicant's argument filed 25 January 2008 have been fully considered and are not persuasive.

Applicant argues that: "neither Watts nor Guzman disclose or teach the requirements of claims 1, 13 and 25 for tagging files to be stored in the storage device according to the selected personality and for implementing a filter which (a) passes files tagged according to the selected personality to an application executing within the computer and removed the tags applied by the code which is effective to tag files and which (b) blocks files not tagged according to the selected personality from being passed to the application executing within the computer."

Examiner maintains that: Guzman discloses tag files to be stored in the storage device according to the selected personality (column 11, lines 60-67 - column 12, lines 1-10, Guzman teaches the concept of tagging file by using the filename designation. Filename designation is done based on unique identifier which would be considered as selected personality) and implement a filter which (a) passes files tagged according to the selected personality and removes the tags applied by the code which is effective to tag files ("...restoration engine 404 remove character fields and renames the restoration file .." - e.g., column 13, lines 5-15) and which (b) blocks files not tagged according to the selected personality from being passed to the application executing within the computer (column 11, lines 60-67 to column 12, lines 1-10, Guzman teaching this concept by

appending a filename designation with an associated unique identifier and as described by Guzman this identifier can be used in the computer system for later use for restoration processing which would let the user access the appropriate file (i.e. files with associated unique identifier. Applicant should note that if the files can be viewed remotely according to the network element with which file data is associated then this implementation can be done only within a computer).

Applicant argues that: "Watts, Guzman, and Kataoka, taken separately or in combination do not anticipate the requirements of claims 5, 17, and 29, each as amended herein, for, when at least one application other than an operating system is executed in the computer, a change in the selected personality based on the newly provided input not to require termination of the at least one application."

Examiner maintains that: Watts discloses when at least one application other than an operating system is executed in the computer, a change in the selected personality based on newly provided input does not require termination of the at least one application (column 9, lines 30-35 and lines 54-65, column 10, lines 40-60, Someone with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made would understand that Watts teaches selected personality does not require termination of the operating system running when changing the location. Furthermore, if the operating system doesn't terminate when personality changes, any other application running under the same operating system would not require termination unless it's required to terminate the applications as part of design choice for any security concern. Furthermore, Applicant didn't demonstrate or point out any extra steps that are needed to implement this limitation. Therefore, Examiner maintains the above rejection and believes that cited reference of Watts would not require terminating any applications that are running under operating system when there is a location change or personality change.)

Conclusion

23. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to SUMAN DEBNATH whose telephone number is (571)270-1256. The examiner can normally be reached on 8 am to 5 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kim Y. Vu can be reached on 571 272-3859. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/S. D./
Examiner, Art Unit 2135
/KIMYEN VU/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2135